

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on June 19, 2002, claims 1-40 and 66-76 were examined. The specification was objected to for lack of an Abstract. Claims 1, 6, 15, 23, 66, and 73 were objected to. Claims 1-5, 15, 16, 23-40, 66-68, and 73 were allowed. Claims 6-14, 17-22, 69-72, and 74-76 were rejected.

No response to the Office Action was filed by September 19, 2002, and the application went abandoned.


Accompanying this Response is a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 CFR 1.137(b), and an Information Disclosure Statement.

Herein, claims 41-65 and 77-84 are cancelled, and claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 23, 27, 34, 66, 69, 73 and 74 are amended. An Abstract is added to resolve the objection to the specification. Claims 1, 6, 15, 23, 66, and 73 are amended as the Examiner suggested to resolve the identified informalities. Claims 6, 11, 17, 69, and 74 are amended to resolve the rejections under 35 USC 112, ¶ 2. Finally, claims 10 and 27 are amended to correct errors.

CONCLUSION

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408 451-5906 to expedite prosecution of this case.


Respectfully submitted,



James E. Parsons  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,691

Customer No.: 022888

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petitions, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Date: 1/16/2004 Signature:   
Name: Rebecca A. Baumann